1. Activities for young people (15%)
2. More CCTV (12%)
3. More Police (9.7%)
4. Better street lighting (8.5%)

- 15.34% of those surveyed had been victims of a crime within the previous year

- 92.4% felt that drug addiction contributes to someone turning to crime. The majority of respondents also felt that lack of a supporting family, poor education and lack of things to do were contributing factors

- A majority of respondents felt that the following three approaches would be very effective at preventing crime:
  1. Increasing the number of Police officers
  2. Tougher sentencing
  3. CCTV

- 57.3% of people surveyed felt that the Police were good or very good at preventing crime in their area and 34.7% felt the same about the local council. 53.9% of respondents marked "don't know" when asked about Community Safety Partnerships

---

Recommendation 2:
It is recommended that Carlisle City Council develop a clear definition of anti-social behaviour, which reflects citizens concerns, and make a unambiguous public commitment to Community Safety.

Key Partner Consultation

Consultation was carried out with key partners who are involved in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. Some of the members are statutory partners and others are interested bodies that were invited to participate.

This survey involved face to face interviews with seventeen representatives of the agencies. The agencies included: Cumbria Fire Service, Crimestoppers, Carlisle Drugs Reference Group, National Probation Service, Cumbria Police, Cumbria Neighbourhood Watch, Connexions, Eden District Council, Carlisle City Council, Cumbria Drugs Action Team, Clerk to the Magistrates Courts, Carlisle and District Parish Councils Association, Cumbria County Council, Cumbria Youth Offending Team, Cumbria Partnership Support (G.O.N.W. funded).

The review team designed the questionnaire used for this exercise. (Appendix 3)

Key Findings

Without exception all agencies saw benefits to working in partnership to reduce crime and disorder and were in favour of future partnership collaboration although many had barriers to overcome to enable them to be effective. Maintaining good partnership working needs understanding of differing working cultures and political environments and ensuring appropriate networks are in place is key to increasing opportunities for crime reduction and the delivery of Community Safety.

> **Recommendation 8:**
> **It is recommended that Carlisle City Council** establishes a basis for the exchange of depersonalised information, with partner agencies that have proved difficult to engage, and actively promote and involve Education, Social Services and Health in the problem solving process.

The meeting cycle of the partnership and its task groups was identified as a barrier to progress and raised as a matter for concern particularly as all respondents thought that the meetings were either unproductive, the task group structure did not work or that the attendance was inappropriate to the issues.

All respondents could point to initiatives happening as a direct result of partnership activity and many had been directly involved in identifying initiatives and in managing and monitoring progress. When asked for areas for improvement, the most common response was to reduce the frequency of meetings and to narrow the focus to fewer agencies.

Some respondents felt that the community should be involved at a different level and that their information and intelligence should be made to count in decision-making and as a result Community intelligence is now a standing item on the agenda of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Leadership group. The CDRP anticipate that this will convey a message that community information is taken seriously at a high level, which it is hoped, will encourage more information and ultimately assist in reducing the fear of crime. Further more, development of the Community Intelligence model will enhance problem identification.

Many felt that the whole partnership structure should be revisited and that a thematic approach would lend itself well to flexibility in the future and also to new joint working with Eden District Council.

Nearly all respondents felt that the strategy was not driving the actions and that the partnership should not lose its focus from the aims of the strategy. Training for partners came out as a major issue and areas where partners felt they needed more expertise included Section 17, Problem Solving, Partnership Development and Facilitation Skills. Respondents saw their future involvement at two different levels. Senior members saw themselves as part of a tighter more focused strategically centred group where practitioners saw their involvement in the problem solving process.

> **Recommendation 1:**
> It is recommended that Carlisle City Council in conjunction with the CDRP apply the problem-solving model to the issue of Fear of Crime, and develop a positive Communications Strategy that facilitates and takes account of local views and ensures that they are aware of the progress of the CDRP Crime and Disorder Strategy in order to impact on the issue of fear of crime.

Focus Group Consultation

Three separate focus groups were conducted with the intention to obtain views on effectiveness of current and previous initiatives, community priorities for the future and knowledge of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

nacro

Key Findings

Youth Focus Group

This exercise was in two parts. Part 1 being with agencies that provide or are involved in the provision of youth services and part 2 with youths themselves.

Part 1

With the exception of one agency there was no knowledge of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. Key areas of concern regarding crime and disorder emerged as fear of crime and quality of life. Joint working with Eden was seen as a positive step and the way forward and CCTV was considered an effective solution, particularly for burglary and vehicle crime. Partnership should do more to publicise activities and market itself to the wider community and the majority believed there was less crime than three years ago.

Part 2

There was no knowledge of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership but definite support for a partnership approach. The lack of youth provision was considered a major factor in youth offending and the majority believed there to be more crime than three years ago. CCTV was viewed as successful and that extensions of CCTV would lead to further reduction in crime.

Hotspots Focus Group

The hotspots task group existed under the 1999-2002 Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy. This group was used for consultation as part of the review as it was generally felt by the partnership to be performing poorly. Many of the actions originally assigned to it had been completed however the group had lost some of its original focus. CN Research conducted a facilitated discussion with the group in November 2001. The main findings included a lack of awareness of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership and its initiatives. Concern that hotspots should not be defined geographically for long periods as outside factors can affect whether or not crime remains a problem in an area and that analysis is required on a more frequent basis to update audit data. There was also concern around labeling areas as hotspots, which may stigmatise the area and worsen its prospects.

The group had proved useful as a means of information exchange and as it involved members of the community, maintained the necessary community links. Unfortunately the group had not achieved any real successes despite having access to funding and it was considered that a group of this nature ought to address the issue of fear of crime, engaging the community in the process.

Recommendation 4:
It is recommended that Carlisle City Council disband the task group dedicated to geographic 'hotspots' and apply the problem solving model to areas with above average crime, involving the relevant communities at every stage of the process and ensuring all new approaches to community safety have clear objectives and are monitored and evaluated.

---

nacro

NACRO Consultation

Nacro

Nacro facilitated workshops in February 2002 in order to validate the emerging priorities of the Crime and Disorder audit. Participants were selected and invited from a broad range of residents and groups in Carlisle, which comprised of Youth Groups, Hard to reach groups, Federation of Women's Institutes, WRVS, Tenants groups, representatives from Carlisle Voluntary services, Carlisle Diocesan Office, Northumbria University, St Martins College Carlisle, Newton Rigg College Penrith, Cumbria association Head Teachers, Primary Head Teachers Association, Voluntary Action Cumbria, Citizens Advice Bureau, Community Centre managers, National Farmers Union, Young Farmers Association and Cumbria Healthy Schools Association Co-ordinator and representatives from tenant and resident group members in Carlisle.

A total of three consultation sessions were completed and the groups consulted were as follows;

Table 1: Community Groups Consulted

Adult residents from Carlisle	12
Adults residents from Eden District Council	6
Young People from Eden District Council	11

The purpose of these workshops was to validate the assessment of the initial findings of the Crime and Disorder Audit and the partnership considered it was important to engage the services of an independent organization to undertake this evaluative process in order to maintain objectivity.

The specific objectives of the consultation were to;

- Obtain the views of local people about the key priorities in Carlisle and Eden's Crime and Reduction Disorder Strategy
- Gather consultees views about how specific crime and disorder issues, arising out of the strategic priorities, ought to be addressed
- Identify each group's views on the best way to consult and involve people living in Carlisle and Eden District about community safety issues

During the consultation sessions the following questions were addressed;

- ➢ What are your concerns about crime and disorder in your area?
- ➢ Do your concerns about crime and disorder correspond to the priorities identified by the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in Carlisle and Eden?
- ➢ Would you be interested in taking part in this type of consultation event again?
- ➢ How do you think that deliverers of local community safety services e.g. the police and local authorities) should consult with people?

Anti-social behaviour, in a variety of forms, was the primary concern for this particular focus group. Various factors were identified that were considered to be the cause of anti-social behaviour. Drugs and alcohol were identified as being a major cause of crime and it was felt that alcohol abuse lead to violent crime and drug abuse to property crime, such as burglary. The group also felt that victims of crime were given insufficient support whilst young people identified bullying as a concern. They felt bullying was a problem in school, in the home and elsewhere. Awareness of the details of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership was limited. Properly organised consultation meetings which were informative and enabled the communities opinion to be considered, were viewed as very important.

> **Recommendation 2:**
> **It is recommended that Carlisle City Council** develop a clear definition of anti-social behaviour, which reflects citizens concerns, and make a unambiguous public commitment to Community Safety.

Nacro also conducted a consultation exercise with various council officers using a questionnaire. (Appendix 4)

Consultation with council officers

A questionnaire was sent out by email to 14 council officers. 5 were returned - a response rate of 36%.

It is worth noting that the low response rate may partly be due to officers being on holiday at the time the questionnaires were sent out but also due to some officers believing that Community Safety is not part of their remit. The following departments from Carlisle City Council were representative of those responding;
Housing Department (HD)
Design Division (DD)
Economic Development Unit (EDU)
Legal Services (LS)

The subjects covered in the questionnaire included:

- Personal knowledge and understanding of community safety issues and the Crime and Disorder Act (1998)
- Best practice in community safety
- How the delivery of community safety functions might be improved

Of the four departments responding the number of staff involved in delivering community safety related work is as follows;

nacro

Table 2: Number of staff involved in delivering community safety related work

Department	Number of staff and time spent	Full Time Equivalent
Housing Department	• One full time • 17 staff spends 30% of their time on tenancy enforcement issues.	• 1.0 • 5.1
Design Division	• 5 people approx. 50 hours per week, • 7 CCTV operators @ 24 hours per week	• 1.35 • 4.54
Legal Services	• 1 member of staff (1-2 hours per week estimated)	• 0.05
Economic Development Unit	• Business support – monthly meeting with businesses. Community safety may or may not be raised. • Managed centers - 8 staff with some involvement • New Deal, 3 staff involved	• 0.01 (estimate) • 4.0 (estimate) • 1.5 (estimate)
Full Time Equivalent Hours spent on Community Safety by those responding to questionnaire		• 17.5

Knowledge And Understanding Of Community Safety Issues And The Crime and Disorder Act (1998)

Issues affecting the local community such as crime and disorder, fear of crime, security of homes and safety of residents were included in the definition of Community Safety and integrated measures and partnerships to enhance and maximise public safety were considered to relate to the meaning of Community Safety. Activities to reduce crime and disorder and their causes through partnership between agencies and communities was another offering for what is considered to be Community Safety and other attempts included the public perception of safety within an area and a package of measures to reduce crime and disorder.

All the respondents were familiar with the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) to some extent and three (out of five) respondents demonstrated some understanding of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act. The Act was cited as a responsibility to deal with crime and disorder issues on housing estates, Section 17 in particular, and working in partnership with other agencies such as the Police.

Duty under Section 17 was identified as

"to consider and strive for community safety objectives in all spending decisions and actions with Local Authorities and the Police"

and as a requirement to produce Community Safety Strategies.

The Crime and Disorder Act (1998)) was understood as setting out measures for preventing crime and disorder with implications for a range of institutions and legislation to control and limit behaviour which causes disturbance and local crime.

Home Office publications appear to be the favoured option to improve knowledge of community safety with all respondents indicating they would utilise such guidance. National and Council led seminars were considered and utilised by half of the respondents and one reference was made to joint training.

Best Practice In Community Safety

Four (out of five) respondents offered an example of an activity their service provides which they believe to be 'innovative' or 'best practice' in relation to community safety. Two (out of five) respondents provided an example of 'innovation' or 'best practice' in relation to community safety that they were aware of from other local authorities.

Initiatives include a Police Officer seconded to the housing department to tackle crime and disorder and the Design Division cited radio linkage of shops/pubs/clubs/CCTV and Police as their example of best practice. Legal services evidenced issue of grants for security measures to elderly householders subjected to repeat burglary along with successful joint working with the Police and the Housing Department.

Best practice and innovation in relation to community safety from other local authorities was only offered by two respondents and included;

- Safer Estate Agreements with partners such as the Police
- The work that Greenwich Council has done within the Greenwich Community Safety Partnership with Charlton Athletic FC

How The Delivery Of Community Safety Functions Might Be Improved

The respondents were able to provide evidence of links with external organisations regarding the delivery of community safety services although the voluntary and community sectors were under-represented. The respondents' have only limited links with the Community Safety team in their area.

Four (out of five) of the respondents stated that community safety is included in their departmental strategy. All the respondents provided suggestions of how their service could contribute to the Community Safety Strategy. Four (out of five) respondents' stated that their strategy or action plan was linked to the Community Safety Strategy. The majority of participants stated that, if they had a free rein, they would like to see better 'mainstreaming' of community safety through more integration between departments and other interested parties, greater corporate awareness. Section 17 question/comment in all committee reports, better corporate working across the Council and greater eligibility for external resources.

nacro

The majority of participants did not believe that their community safety work could be delivered more effectively by another department or external agency. Adequate funding to address the needs of pilot schemes was suggested as an unmet need or gap in community safety provision. The majority of participants do not have specific targets for improving community safety. Four (out of five) of the participants were unable to state how much it costs to deliver their community safety work Three (out of five) of the participants mentioned adequate resources as the most significant barrier to change or improvement.

Of the four departments responding all four declared their specific department addressed issues relating to anti-social behaviour and three out of the four stated they were concerned with fear of crime and more specifically criminal damage.

Violent crime, specifically domestic violence was not considered an issue that could be addressed by any of the four departments responding also only one out of the four departments stated they were concerned with alcohol and drug related violent/crime. For example, one department evidenced this with the initiative 'Manage New Deal 18-24 Voluntary Sector Option', which does include some clients that may have a family background, which has restricted their ability to be ready for the workplace.

This example was also used to evidence addressing prolific offending behaviour with again only one out of four respondents claiming they had any dealings with this issue, either from a perpetrator or hot spot perspective.

Examples of how the responding departments address these issues include instigating legal action against offenders, advising on and applying for Anti Social Behaviour Orders, when instructed to do so, monitoring of offender behaviour, improving security features of dwellings, Repeat Victimisation Security Grants and recharging offenders for criminal damage where possible. Other initiatives include raising any issues with the relevant agency or Council department, being vigilant to prevent crime at Council owned and managed premises and dealing with incidents of crime that occur, CCTV, lighting and general, secured by design principles, in highways and public open spaces.

None of the respondent had any real knowledge of safer estates agreements, and links with the Community Safety Team in the area were described as very limited with specific departments co-opted as appropriate to tackle specific tasks. The cross-departmental Regeneration Team was identified as being instrumental in maintaining links and internal re-structuring was considered as a possible improvement in this area. Following the organisational review it is anticipated that a number of departments will be in the same unit, which will facilitate improvements in this area.

The council services identified as those working with to deliver community safety were:

- Community Safety Co-ordinator
- Property Services
- Planning
- Community Support
- Economic development
- Leisure
- Housing

External partners identified as those working with the City Council included Police, CAB, Law Centre, YOT Probation, Retailers, County Council, Home Office, Other 5 Cumbrian Districts NWDA, Cumbria Inward Investment Agency, Small Business Service, Chamber of Commerce, Jobcentre Plus, Connexions, Impact Housing, local schools, HE and FE sector, Eden District Council and Housing Associations.

Addressing community safety is included in three out of the four departmental strategies and knowledge of Crime and Disorder issues, improving awareness of the detail within the strategy, targeted work with local businesses, city centre retailers and the Chamber and better integration under the new organisational structure were considered as suggestions to improve the service.

The Community Safety Strategy, the Community Plan and Housing Improvement Plan appeared to be the only strategies that departments were linking their plans and strategies into with the Policing Plan and Drug Action Plan not being considered for any of the responding departments own strategies.

In conclusion the following were considered as the current big issues or problems that the service has to address if it is to improve;

- Mapping what is going on. Eradicating overlaps and tackling gap filling
- More awareness of the Community Safety Partnership within Council departments and with agencies not directly involved.
- Linking the work of the Partnership with other Council and partnership activities (conversely partnership and meeting overload)
- Securing public participation
- Causes of Anti-social behaviour

Major demographic or social trends that were considered may effect the service in the future include youth disorder and drink related leisure time issues, increasing student population in city, heavy reliance on low wage and low skilled jobs, higher than average youth unemployment and knock on effects of restructuring of the agricultural sector and decline in services (shops, banking facilities, public transport, schools etc) in rural areas. Also the high position of some parts of the district in the index of multiple deprivation, breakdown of community spirit, lack of respect for service providers and unwillingness to become involved in most communities possibly due to fear of reprisals.

Barriers to change or improvement were highlighted as lack of corporate understanding and a need to project objectives to create a shared vision. Lack of in house resources, limited access to external funding, partnership overload, urban centred national policies, adequacy of funding, lack of public participation, and restraint on information sharing between agencies imposed by data protection legislation.

Recommendation 6:
It is recommended that Carlisle City Council develop a clear procedure for all departments and members on how to deal with community safety issues, clarifying and securing shared corporate goals and targets for Community Safety

---

nacro

The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) has now adopted "Problem Solving" a tried and tested method in crime reduction and examining the causes of crime and this approach is to be used throughout the life of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy 2002-05

As a result of this review, Quality of Life is now one of three key themes in the 2002-2005 Strategy and this review supports the intention of the CDRP to implement a media strategy which will include a website, a publication of information relating to successes and activity on a quarterly basis and a target to increase partnership awareness by 10%.

- The partnership will be holding a consultation and review forum every six months. The events will be advertised as 'open to the public' and the aim is to involve the community in evaluating previous activity and directing future resources. It is hoped that increased involvement will lead to reduced fear of crime
- Community intelligence is now a standing item on the agenda of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Leadership group. The message that community information is taken seriously at a high level should ensure that more information comes through and should also assist in reducing fear of crime
- The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership will apply the problem-solving model to the issue of Fear of Crime and this will produce an action plan by December 2002. The problem solving exercise is likely to examine how the authority works to reduce fear of crime, how the authority works with other agencies and what activity other agencies are involved in to reduce fear of crime. Funding sources will also be examined at this point

COMPETE

The 1999 Act does not require authorities to subject their functions to competition but fair and open competition will most often be the best way of demonstrating that a function is being carried out competitively.

The guidance states that services should not be delivered directly if other more efficient and effective means are available. Retaining work in-house will therefore only be justified where the authority can show it's competitive with the best alternative.

The Community Safety Service under review encompasses three elements:

1. The work of Carlisle City Council within the Community Safety Partnership
2. The liaison between the partnership and the authority and the administration in driving forward the strategy within the authority.
3. The work of the council and it's various services in individual crime reduction initiatives and the day-to-day work of the council in a range of areas where improving safety is a consideration in the process.

Elected Members Focus Group

The Nacro facilitated focus group conducted with elected members also debated the element of 'Compete' within the Best Value process of this review.

The focus group conducted with elected members deemed Carlisle City Council as a co-ordinator for other providers and not a discrete provider. Community Safety requires careful specification of tasks and functions however the members felt there is potential for the Crime and Disorder Audit process to be contracted out in the future.

Community Safety is also considered by the members to be a cross cutting theme that impacts on all other reviews however in respect of this there is concern about how much involvement the Community Safety Officer currently has in other Best Value Reviews and other key pieces of work within the council e.g. not currently involved in developing the Housing Strategy.

Carlisle City Council is considered by the members group to be the most appropriate agent for promotion and co-ordination of community safety, particularly around the issue of credibility. Elected members felt it would be useful to look at the best performers in the public, private and voluntary sectors, and also look at family / groupings, when assessing Carlisle City Council's performance in Community Safety although it was acknowledged that it could be difficult to draw comparisons. /

Available options for the delivery of Community Safety

It was agreed by focus group participants that there are potential alternative options for delivering Community Safety other than Carlisle City Council alone, which include Carlisle and Eden districts joint working, through the Local Strategic Partnership, improved internal co-ordination (under new structure), and the Carlisle Housing Association. Potentially all of these could be considered as competitive opportunities for alternative or improved delivery of community safety and require a further detailed analysis as to feasibility for the future.

Options to achieve economies of scale through a joined-up approach or "buy in" of functions?

There was agreement within the group that working in partnership with the Police is providing more opportunities, particularly through the generating and compiling of audit data. Health Action Zones were identified as having a part to play but as an alternative option for delivery of community safety, it was considered to be too early to make that judgement.

Regeneration Initiatives were considered to be more robust, gathering momentum and attracting government funds and were accepted as a possible area to explore.

Whilst options for alternate provision are wide-ranging elected members believed it more appropriate to assess whether the current arrangement representative?

It was unanimously agreed that "buying in" is not viable and that it's important that the Council retain responsibility to avoid confusion. There was particular concern that outside organisations "work to own agendas" which may have a negative impact on service delivery.

CONCLUSION

Much of the work around Community Safety will not show immediate results. For example, the benefits of addressing the causes of offending behaviour are likely to take years to realise. A long-term approach is needed and current best practice

nacro

suggests that certain factors are more likely to produce a positive result.

This review of Community Safety is mainly an attempt to improve the service for local people and refine and develop the vision of Community Safety for Carlisle City Council. The overall impact will be a more co-ordinated and prioritised approach to Community Safety and if best practice is adopted across the organisation this will build upon already improved working relationships with outside agencies and take partnership working to another level.

This Best Value review examines Carlisle City Council's approach to Community Safety. The review process has mainly been concerned with whether a good service is being provided to the citizens of Carlisle in respect of community safety and whether or not it will improve.

The overall assessment is that Carlisle City Council provides a good service that is likely to improve in the short term if the recommendations contained in this review are fully implemented. Some progress has been made during the process of conducting this review in that there is now a joint CDRP with Eden district Council and some of the issues exposed during the review process have been identified within the Carlisle and Eden Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy.

Partnerships should develop a strategy for communicating with local people, paying particular attention to those living in areas of greatest need and/or who are most vulnerable, to ensure they can make people aware of attempts to reduce anti-social behaviour, including progress and successes.

The council is working well with other partners to reduce crime and has some good initiatives and crime levels are falling in line with national trends. However the Council is not joining up the work of its internal services sufficiently to deliver on corporate or local strategy aims in reducing crime. Community Safety services are variable and reflect different stages of development. Some projects lack criteria for success and are not evaluated. Carlisle City Council does not give as much priority to this area as its citizens feel it should. There is a lack of emphasis on outcomes for the public.

Throughout the consultation process it was apparent that anti-social behaviour was the primary concern of those who were consulted. The success of Carlisle and Eden's joint Crime and Disorder Strategy may depend on the partnerships' ability to effectively tackle anti-social behaviour and to be seen to be addressing it. A clear definition of anti-social behaviour needs to be developed and communicated, agencies need to be clear what it does and does not constitute.

This Best Value Review supports the intention to appoint a dedicated Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator as indicated within Carlisle and Eden's Crime and Disorder Strategy and the decision to incorporate community intelligence into the decision making process. The newly appointed co-ordinator, in a dedicated role, will be in a position to devise a strategy to ensure this aim is developed and actively applied.

Carlisle City Council has made a number of service specific improvements including conducting a consultation process with residents to engage them in community safety issues. However internal consultation with service departments proved difficult and raises the question of how high profile is the issue of community safety across the organisation.

The review recognises the level of expertise that exists within Carlisle City Council and has sought to use that expertise and build upon it during the course of the review. The review must also take into account the views of service users and the resulting recommendations have sought to balance organisational aims and objectives with operational needs and requirements. By progressing the recommendations of the report there will be a more efficient and effective Community Safety function over time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* in conjunction with the CDRP apply the problem-solving model to the issue of Fear of Crime, examining how the authority works to reduce the fear of crime, how the authority works with other agencies and what activity other agencies are involved in to reduce fear of crime. Funding sources will also need to be examined and it is recommended that the City Council develop a positive Communications Strategy that facilitates and takes account of local views and ensures that they are aware of the progress of the CDRP Crime and Disorder Strategy in order to impact on the issue of fear of crime.

2. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* develop a clear definition of anti-social behaviour, which reflects citizens concerns, and make a unambiguous public commitment to Community Safety. This will need to be developed and communicated, as all agencies need to be clear what does and does not constitute anti-social behaviour.

3. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* explore fully the use of the Community Punishment Scheme and curfew orders which can then be linked to the findings of the problem solving exercise on Prolific Offenders and Crime Hotspots, making the most of the Court system as a useful source of information on offender profiling.

4. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* disband the task group dedicated to geographic 'hotspots' and apply the problem solving model to areas with above average crime, involving the relevant communities at every stage of the process and ensuring all new approaches to community safety have clear objectives and are monitored and evaluated.

5. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* consider the three level approach of corporate, service area and committee to ensure acknowledgment and understanding of the requirements of Section 17. Training and raising awareness of the implications of Section 17 needs to be conducted with operational staff and more local authority personnel should be included in the County wide training programme.

6. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* develop a clear procedure for all departments and members on how to deal with community safety issues, clarifying and securing shared corporate goals and targets for Community Safety and therefore make crime and disorder issues real for service departments by integrating community safety objectives either from local community strategies or county wide actions into service planning, ensuring these are communicated to frontline staff in a way which is relevant to their job. Elected members must challenge any cursory reference to community safety within future committee reports to assist the mainstreaming of community safety into corporate business.

7. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* carry out problem solving exercises throughout the implementation and development of the 2002-05 strategy around the wider issues of community safety involving the community in setting priorities.

8. *It is recommended that Carlisle City Council* establishes a basis for the exchange of depersonalised information, with partner agencies that have proved difficult to engage, and actively promote and involve Education, Social Services and Health in the problem solving process.